

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION**

SARAH DILLARD,
Plaintiff

v.

**INTERNACIONAL REALTY
MANAGEMENT, LLC, L. MIGUEL
ARCE,**
Defendants

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

No. 1:22-CV-01215-DAE

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff Sarah Dillard’s Motion to Compel, Dkt. 27. The District Judge referred the motion to the undersigned for disposition. The Court set the motion for hearing, and, after considering the parties’ filings, the arguments made at the hearing, and the applicable law, the Court announced its ruling, and the reasons for it, on the record. In particular, the Court denied Dillard’s motion and sustained Defendants Internacional Realty Management, LLC and L. Miguel Arce’s objections to the discovery requests that were addressed in Dillard’s motion—namely, Requests for Production Nos. 2, 9-14, and Interrogatory No. 1.

It is worth noting what was *not* addressed in Dillard’s motion and, thus, was not ruled upon at the hearing. In the Court’s order setting the motion for hearing, the Court required the parties to confer and file a joint advisory “discuss[ing] the parties’ conference, identify[ing] any remaining disputed issues that will require resolution by the Court at the hearing, and set[ting] forth *briefly* the parties’ respective positions on each remaining issue.” Dkt. 33, at 1-2 (emphasis added). In the parties’ 14-page

advisory, Dillard raised numerous complaints that either were not addressed at all in her original motion or were briefed so generally as to inadequately apprise the Court of the dispute. These included, among other things, complaints about Defendants' compliance with the parties' electronic-discovery protocols, a request for Defendants' financial documents, and a request for sanctions to be awarded for Defendants' alleged malfeasance(s). Without assigning blame, the undersigned observes that the parties have not sufficiently conferred on these issues. The Court alerted the parties to this fact and trusts that after prompt, meaningful discussion of these remaining issues, an agreement can be reached. If not, the parties can raise these matters with the Court in the form of a motion.

For the reasons stated on the record, the Court **DENIES** Dillard's motion to compel, Dkt. 27, and **SUSTAINS** Defendants' objections to Requests for Production Nos. 2, 9-14, and Interrogatory No. 1.

SIGNED November 14, 2023.



DUSTIN M. HOWELL
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE